

೧-೩೦ ಪಿ. ಎಂ.

SRI G. B. SHANKAR RAO.—This is a problem which affects the entire rural population. When I asked the Deputy Commissioner, he said that there was no funds to spend for that purpose. I have also received letter from him stating that there was no funds. The Department of Public Health Engineering spares mechanics for the repair of the equipments. But the difficulty is about the funds. So, the Government should take up this matter very seriously and see that sufficient funds are placed at the disposal of the Deputy Commissioners of each District to provide drinking water to the rural population.

SRI K. PRABHAKAR.—Arrangements have already been made to place sufficient funds at the disposal of the Deputy Commissioners. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಈ ವಸ್ತುವನ್ನವರೆಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿಂಥ ಮಾತಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾಳೆಯಿಂದ ಈ ಕೊರತೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹರ್ವರ್ನಿಂಗ್ ಆಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಪಿ.ಎಚ್.ಇ. ಮತ್ತು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿ.ಡಿ.ಒ. ಅವರ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವೈಕ್ಯಾನಿಕ್ ಏನು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಲಹೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಆ ಮಿಷನರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಸ್ಟೆರ್ ಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತರಿಸಲು ಎಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡು ಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡು ಕೊಡಲು ಹ ವಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಸುಲಲಿತವಾಗಿ ಆಯಾಯ ವಿರಿಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಎರಡು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯೂನಿಟ್‌ಗಳೆಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮೊದಲು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಯೂನಿಟ್‌ಗಳು ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ತೊಂದರೆ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಡಿ.ಸಿ.ಯವರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಹೋದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೊರತೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವಿರಿ. ಅವರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ದುಡ್ಡಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವನ್ನು ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದೃಢವಾದ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಈ ವಸ್ತುವನ್ನವರೆಗೂ ಕೊರತೆ ಇತ್ತು. ಇದನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಈ ಕೊರತೆಯ ನಿವಾರಣೆಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Matters Under Rule 312

(i) *re : Sealing of the office room of Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda of Bangalore University.*

† SRI K. PUTTASWAMY (Chamaraja).—Sir, I am raising a point under Rule 312. This relates to the conduct of Bangalore City Police in locking the office of Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda of Bangalore University. I have come to know that the office room of Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda both in Jnanabharathi and also the post-graduate centre at Central College are locked for the purpose of conducting a search in the office. Sir, I am aware that we cannot question the conduct of the Police. If the circumstances necessitate locking up rooms for the purpose of search or breaking open the lock for the purpose of search. That arises only on the basis of the complaint

Asterisks indicate that remarks or speeches have not been revised by the member concerned.

that was preferred to the Police. I have come to know that the substance of the complaint preferred by the Police did not warrant locking of rooms to conduct search. Sir, I learn that the complaint was that the Professor was trying to favour a student in respect of a matter relating to his examination. After the conduct of the examination when the valuation of papers are over, howsoever eminent the Professor may be, howsoever influential or powerful he may be, he would not be able to show any favour to any student. It has to be done by the University itself. At the best what the Professor can do is to write a letter to the University bringing the circumstances which require a generous attitude of the University towards the student. The complaint is also to the effect that the Professor had written a letter to the Vice-Chancellor in respect of a student relating to the examination. If that is correct then, whatever letters he might have written could have been secured from the University. It was unnecessary either to lock the rooms or to search the rooms of the Professor. What are the contents of the complaint? On the basis of that complaint whether any additional information has been received by the Police and whether there is any justification for locking the rooms and conducting a search? I am deliberately confining to this subject. I know there are several matters agitating the minds of the public and also the Members of this House. But I am referring to this one incident where according to me, and on the information that I have come to know, the conduct of the Police in locking the rooms of the Professor was not justified.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಬೊಮ್ಮಾಯಿ (ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಯವರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಒಬ್ಬ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್ ರೂಮ್‌ಗೆ ಕೀಲಿ ಹಾಕಿ ಸರ್ಚ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ if there was any allegation against the Professor and he is made accused, ಆಗ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರೋಲೀಸರು ಸರ್ಚ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇದೆ. Incriminating article relating to offence ಇದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಮಾಚಾರ ಪ್ರೋಲೀಸರಿಗೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಚ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರೋಲೀಸರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆತರಹ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನಡೆದಂಥ ಘಟನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ವ್ಯಕ್ತ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕಾಲೇಜ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಆದಂಥ ಆಟಾಕ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಡೀ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ಪ್ರೋಲೀಸರು ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದಾಗ ಒಬ್ಬ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟೇಬಲ್‌ನನ್ನು ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್‌ರವರ ರೂಮನ್ನು ಸರ್ಚ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಏನು ಎಂದು ನಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇವತ್ತು ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಈ ಒಂದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಬ್ಬ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್‌ರವರ ರೂಮಿಗೆ ಕೀಲಿ ಹಾಕಿ ಸರ್ಚ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದರ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಣಾಮವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಒಬ್ಬ ಗಣ್ಯ ಪ್ರಾಧ್ಯಾಪಕರ ಗೌರವದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ, ಅವರು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಂಗಸುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ರೂಮು ಸರ್ಚ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಆಧಾರಗಳು ಇರಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ದುರುಪಯೋಗವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಪ್ರಾಧ್ಯಾಪಕರ ಅಪಮಾನದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೇ ಈ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯ ನಡೆದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಖಂಡನೀಯ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು, ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ

ದೂರಗಳು ಇದೆಯೇ ? ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಇನ್‌ಕ್ವಿರಿಮಿನೇಟಿಂಗ್ ಆರ್ಕಿವಲ್ ಇದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವರು ವೈಸ್‌ಚಾನ್ಸಲರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದಂಥ ಪತ್ರದ ಕಾಪಿಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ರೂಮನ್ನು ಲಾಕ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆ ಪತ್ರ ಅವರ ಟೀಬಿಲ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಇತ್ತು, ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಚ್ ಮಾಡಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದ ವರದಿ ಮುಖೇನ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೆ ರೂಮನ್ನು ಲಾಕ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. The original letter was with the Vice-Chancellor. Copy was on the table ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒರೀಜನಲ್ ಲೆಟರ್ ವೈಸ್‌ಚಾನ್ಸಲರವರ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರೇ ಸ್ವತಃ ಬಂದು ಸರ್ಚ್ ಕಂಡಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಇಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಮಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರುತ್ತಾ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದು ಇದರಿಂದ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ನಾನು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿದಂತಹ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಫೀಸಿಯಲ್ಸ್ ಯಾರೇ ಇರಲಿ ಅವರ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಘಟನೆ ನಡೆಯಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಗೋಕಾಕ್‌ರವರು, ಮಾನ್ಯ ನರಸಿಂಹಯ್ಯನವರಂತಹ ಗಣ್ಯರು ಒಂದು ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹೋದಂತಹ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವತ್ತಿನದಿವಸ ನಾನು, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಗೋಕಾಕ್‌ರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲೇ ಇದ್ದೆನು. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕತೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಂತಹ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ನರಸಿಂಹಯ್ಯನವರು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಹೋದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಮಗ್ರ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಓದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿನಾಯಕರೂ ಸಹ ಅದೇ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರೂ ಸಹ ಇಲ್ಲೇ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಸವಿನಯ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ದೋಷಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೋಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕೀರ್ತಿ ತರುವಂಥ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವಾಗಿ ಅದು ಮಾರ್ಪಾಡಾಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವ ದೋಷಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಮಗ್ರವಾದ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, regarding the matter raised by hon. Member Sri K. Puttaswamy, I wish to make this brief statement :

The Commissioner of Police, Bangalore City, received information on 23rd March 1978 that Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda was in possession of a letter written by him to the Vice-Chancellor, regarding the performance of a student, Rangaswamy in examination. The Commissioner tried to verify this from the Professor, but the letter was not immediately available. As the student Rangaswamy was concerned in some cases under investigation in connection with the disturbances in Bangalore University, the Commissioner of Police thought it necessary to search for and seize the letter alleged to be written. In order to ensure that the letter will not be lost, the local police sealed the chambers of Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda both in the Central College and Jnana Bharathi on 23rd March 1978. This was done with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor. Later, between 1-30 p.m. and 2-30 p.m. the room in Jnana Bharathi was searched in the presence of the Registrar and the Controller of Examinations. The office copy of a letter addressed by Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda to

the Controller of Examinations was seized under a mahazar, for purposes of investigation in Cr. No. 231/78 of Ulsoore Gate Police Station. The gist of the letter was to the effect that Sri Rangaswamy may be permitted to do the sessionals so that Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda may conduct the Sessionals for him. After seizure of the letter, the rooms were released.

This information I have before me, Sir. Now, the information I have given to the house is self-explanatory. I have just placed before the House the circumstances under which the search had to be made.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am happy, Sir, that the gist of what I stated, on information, is borne out by the information supplied by the Government. I would like the Hon. Chief Minister to bestow some thought on the information that he has furnished to the House. Even in my preliminary remarks, I said that all their attempt was to find out a copy of the letter that Dr. Venkatagiri Gowda was reported to have written to the University. Sir, the original was in possession of the University. So, there was no need or justification for taking this extreme step of locking the room and searching the office of the Professor. Now, in the eye of Law, there cannot be any discrimination. Whether he is a Lecturer, or a Professor or the Vice-Chancellor or a peon, in the eye of Law are same. I am not saying that because it concerns a Professor, the matter is big. When the original was there, when the substance was in the University, where was the necessity to try to catch the shadow? Supposing the University had destroyed that letter and if that letter was very important for this case, then, I can understand the necessity for a search.

Supposing I express my opinion, then it would be a opinion of the individual member. Now I am requesting the Hon. Chief Minister to bestow some thought and tell us whether in his opinion this is justified.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I am not here to sit in judgement over what has taken place. In the ultimate analysis, the Police Officers have erred in their discretion. It is for the proper authorities to look into. I cannot say. But, under the circumstances, it is apparent that the Professor was alleged to have written a letter either to the Vice-Chancellor or to somebody else. This was with reference to a case already registered against a student by name Rangaswamy in connection with the disturbances in Bangalore University. It is alleged that the Professor was interested in Rangaswamy's passing the examination. That was the allegation and in that connection. Prof. Gowda appears to have written to the Vice-Chancellor or to

somebody else. Whether it was a vague information, or whether it was addressed to the Vice-Chancellor or the Controller of Examinations, at that stage, was not known. If it was to the Vice-Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor would have had the letter which he has received from him but it was found that the alleged letter was written to the Controller of Examinations.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—The Controller of Examinations is a part of the University.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—The allegation is that both of them have combined. Unless the Controller is willing to produce the letter, how is it possible? The Controller of Examinations may not produce it.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Then, simultaneously they should have conducted the search of the Controller's Office also. I cannot understand that a situation where a Vice-Chancellor can have no control over the Controller of Examinations.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—In your view, it may be so. But subsequently after the search which was duly conducted, we have got a copy of the letter found in his room. Subsequently what is going to happen, I cannot say at this stage.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—In your statement you have stated that the Commissioner of Police, Bangalore City, received information on 23rd March 1978 to the effect that Prof. Venkatagiri Gowda was in possession of a letter written by him to the Vice-Chancellor regarding the performance of a student, Rangaswamy in examination.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—That is an information.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The Vice-Chancellor was contacted before the room was locked and they must have questioned the Vice-Chancellor whether such a letter had been received by him.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—The letter must have been written to someone else.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The statement says that the letter addressed to the Controller of Examinations was seized. In that case simultaneously, action should have been taken. Then, there are some serious allegations against this University.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I think the Minister for Education has already stated about it. The Government have requested the Chancellor to look into these affairs and conduct internal inquiry or constitute a Committee to review the whole question.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Let the Hon. Minister for Education say about the steps he had taken in this connection.

SRI B. SUBBAIAH SHETTY.—In the other House there was a demand that some inquiry regarding the working of the Bangalore University should be held. Under Section 61, Chapter XI, subject to correction, of the Universities Act, there is a provision for inquiring into the entire working of the University by appointing a Review Commission. So, the Government are requesting the Chancellor to constitute such a Review Commission and to inquire into the entire working of the University and we are also conveying to the Chancellor the things that have transpired in the other House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ರಾಮದೇವ್.—ವಿನ್ಯಾಸ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಇದು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ನಡೆದ ಘಟನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ಅಥವಾ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭದಿಂದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರೋ? ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾಲ್ಯದ ಪೀಡಿತವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಲೂ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI B. SUBBAIAH SHETTY.—As contemplated under Chapter XI, it will be conducted.

(ii) *re: Suicide of a teenaged girl due to molestation by a doctor at Victoria Hospital, Bangalore.*

SMT. S. PRAMILA (Chamarajpet).—Sir, I wish to raise a matter under rule 312 regarding the alleged suicide committed by Smt. Leelavathi due to molestation by Dr. Thimmareddy in Victoria Hospital, Bangalore.

SRI M. MALLAPPA (Minister for Health).—Sir, I wish to make the following statement on behalf of the Chief Minister.

On 28th March 1978 at 5-30 P. M one Srinivasa, S/o Papaiah resident of No. 8 Vayapurigalli, Kalasipalyam, informed the Kalasipalyam Police that at about 2-30 P. M. he noticed smoke from upstairs and when he went up along with his neighbours they found his elder sister Padmavathi @ Leelavathi, aged 23 years, dead. She had burnt herself after pouring Kerosene oil on her body. There was a Kerosene stove by her side. (According to him she was having some mental trouble and so she was going to Victoria Hospital very often.) On this statement a case at Crime No. 8/78 under section 174 Criminal Procedure Code was registered as Unnatural Death. The Police took up the investigation and the Inquest was conducted over the dead body. The Post-mortem was done on 29th March 1978 and the Medical Officer has opined that the death was due to shock as a result of burns. On 29th March 1978, Srinivasa, brother of the deceased Leelavathi produced a letter written in Kannada by the deceased. The letter was dated 26th March 1978 addressed to the Commissioner of Police, Bangalore and copied to Police Inspector